

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Non-Final Office Action of May 11, 2010 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 4, 8, 14-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26 and 27 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 8-27 remain in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Telephone Interview

Preliminarily, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Van Handel for the courtesies extended to their representatives during the telephonic interview conducted on June 24, 2010. The following remarks include Applicant's statement of substance of interview in accordance with MPEP § 713.04.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 24 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0003212 A1 to Marler et al. (“Marler”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, the following (emphasis added):

creating one or more integrated video data streams by integrating interactive content into the one or more unmodified video data streams based on one or more rules *targeting receiving devices in a particular geographic location*; and

transmitting the one or more integrated video data streams to one or more receiving devices *having the particular geographic location for simultaneous display of the interactive content with the television content*.

As discussed during the interview Marler does not teach or suggest integrating interactive content based on rules *targeting receiving devices in a particular geographic location*, as recited in Applicant's amended claim 1. Additionally, since Marler does not describe targeting receiving devices in a particular geographic location, Marler further does not teach or suggest the claim 1 feature of transmitting the one or more integrated video data streams to one or more

receiving devices *having the particular geographic location*. As such, Marler does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent claims 8, 15, 20, 24, and 27 recite features similar to integrating interactive content into one or more unmodified video data streams based on one or more rules targeting receiving devices in a particular geographic location, as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 8, 15, 20, 24, and 27 are allowable over Marler at least for similar reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,459,427 to Mao et al. (“Mao”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed during the interview, and acknowledged by the Office Action at p. 4, the personalized channels allegedly described in Mao are “*accessible* through a channel that matches the MAC or IP address associated with that user’s set-top box,” and are thus only displayed after the user sends a request to interact with webcasting services to a MORECAST client engine 230. See Mao, col. 6, lines 30-42. As such, Mao does not teach or suggest transmitting one or more integrated video data streams to one or more receiving devices for *simultaneous display of the interactive content with the television content*, as recited in amended claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable over Mao for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent claims 8, 15, 20, 24, and 27 recite similar features as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and are thus allowable over Mao at least for similar reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the additional features recited therein. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-19, 21-23, and 25-26 each depend from one of claims 1, 8, 15, 20, and 24, and are thus allowable at least based on the allowability of their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1, and claim 13 depends from independent claim 8. As discussed above, Mao does not teach or suggest all of the recited features of amended claims 1 and 8. As such, claims 6 and 13 distinguish over Mao at least based on the allowability of their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 11, 2010

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

GDF:AS:lab